

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/832,171	OTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Callie E. Shosho	1714	
All Participants:		Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u>	
(1) <u>Callie E. Shosho</u> .		(3) _____.	
(2) <u>Clifford Mass</u> .		(4) _____.	
Date of Interview: <u>6 December 2004</u>		Time: _____	
Type of Interview: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: 6,10,37,40,61			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability, Part II above.			
<input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
(Examiner/SPE Signature)		(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. Mass.

The amendment to claims 6, 10, 37, and 40 was made to remove unnecessary and confusing expressions, i.e. [ka-1], [ka-2], and [ka-3], associated with formulae of these claims given that the formulae are already identified as (I), (II), and (III).

The amendment was made to claim 37 to clarify that more than one wetting agent can be used. Such amendment was necessary in light of claim 39, which depends on claim 37, and which discloses the use of mixture of two wetting agents, i.e. acetylene alcohol and acetylene glycol. Support for such amendment is found in original claim 4.

The amendment to claim 61 was made to insert words which were inadvertently missing from the claim. The claim language was amended to recite same language found in present claim 32.